UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
28th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 6 November 1991
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 28th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MROZIEWICZ (Poland)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.28
14 November 1991

ENGLISH

91-61682 7191V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee for an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have joined in sponsoring the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.3: Romania;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4: Brazil and Ukraine;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.5: Argentina;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.7: Bolivia and Indonesia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9: Bolivia, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Greece, Romania and France;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.11: Bolivia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13: Bolivia and Lao People's Democratic Republic;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.15: Bolivia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.16: Bolivia and Chile;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.17: United States of America;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18: Bolivia and Romania;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19: Bolivia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20: Bolivia and Lao People's Democratic Republic;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.21: Bolivia and Lao People's Democratic Republic;

(Mr. Kheradi)

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23: Bolivia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25: Bolivia and Lao People's Democratic Republic;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.26: Bolivia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27: Bolivia and Brazil;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28: Bolivia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.29: Bolivia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.31: Bolivia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.32: Bolivia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33: Cuba, Bolivia, Germany, Philippines and Lao People's Democratic Republic;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.34: Peru;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36: Chile, Cyprus and Uruguay; and

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.40: Bolivia.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Finland, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.5.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): Draft resolution A/46/C.1/L.5, which I have the honour to introduce today, is entitled "Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques" (ENMOD). The draft resolution reflects the results of the consultations which were held by the parties to the ENMOD Convention on 25 October. In this connection, let me welcome the announcement just made by the Secretary of the Committee that Argentina has joined as a sponsor of this draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.5 notes in its operative paragraph 1 that a majority of States parties to the ENMOD Convention have expressed the wish to

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

convene the Second Review Conference of the Parties to this Convention in September 1992 and requests the Secretary-General, as Depositary of the Convention, to begin practical preparations in this regard.

In line with the decision already taken by the First Review Conference in 1984, the Second Review Conference will be held in Geneva. There seems to be widespread agreement that the Preparatory Committee to be established in due course would need to meet only once, most probably in April 1992 in Geneva.

In operative paragraph 2 the Secretary-General is requested to provide for the usual secretariat services required for a review conference. Operative paragraph 3 notes, as is also customary, that the costs of the Review Conference and its preparations will be borne by the States parties.

By September 1992, eight years will have elapsed since the First Review Conference of the ENMOD Convention. By the standards for reviewing multilateral disarmament treaties, eight years is a long interval. There have been many important political and technological developments since 1984. In our view, these developments have had, and will continue to have, an impact on the ENMOD Convention and its future. That impact needs to be assessed and reviewed by the States parties in an organized way. That is why Finland, which was President of the First Review Conference, has taken the initiative for the convening of the Second Review Conference of the ENMOD Convention next year.

Let me add in this connection that recent events, the intentional environmental destruction in the course of the Persian Gulf War, have reinforced our conviction that there is indeed a need to assess what these and other developments may mean in terms of the ENMOD Convention. As a matter of

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

principle, we maintain that dormant disarmament treaties are in nobody's interest, whether parties or not.

Destruction of the environment as a means of warfare is an urgent issue that requires, and is in fact getting, attention in many forums and from many perspectives. The issue is currently being dealt with in the Sixth Committee from the perspective of international humanitarian law. Dealing with it in the context of the ENMOD Convention offers a complementary perspective, that of arms control and disarmament.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

In addition to substantive reasons, the timing of the Second Review Conference of the ENMOD Convention has to take into account other important items on the international disarmament agenda, specifically the timing of other review conferences. From that point of view also, September 1992 is a good time to review the ENMOD Convention for the second time.

Before concluding, I should like to note that according to the latest information available - in document A/46/604 - the ENMOD Convention has been ratified by 54 States and signed but not ratified by another 17 States. Echoing what is also found in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.5 the delegation of Finland expresses the hope for the widest possible adherence to the Convention before the Second Review Conference.

In a similar vein, Finland expresses the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.5 will be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Mr. CHIRILA (Romania) (interpretation from French): At this session of the General Assembly, conventional disarmament, especially concern about excessive and destabilizing transfers, has pride of place in the work of the First Committee. My delegation, together with other delegations, considers that the present international climate gives an excellent opportunity to try to increase openness and transparency in armaments so as to strengthen confidence and regional and international security and stability with a view to contributing to moderation in military production and in arms transfers.

The draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments" (A/C.1/46/L.18) presented by the Twelve and Japan under agenda item 60 (b) in our view answers an important political need, the setting up of a universal, non-discriminatory

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

register for international weapons transfers. We wish to note that operative paragraph 9 fosters transparency in other military matters.

In its statement on 18 October, in the general debate on disarmament matters, my delegation expressed its support for the establishment, under the aegis of the United Nations, of a register of international arms transfers as recommended by the Group of Experts that had dealt with that problem.

May I take this opportunity to state that our delegation has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18, "Transparency in armaments".

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23, submitted by Colombia and Peru, concerning illicit arms transfers, expresses legitimate concern, especially in parts of the world where there are problems of stability and security. As other delegations have expressed here, I said yesterday in my preliminary comments that we consider that that document offers an important additional approach to the initiative of international arms transfers and transparency in this field.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Austria to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.3.

Mr. STELZER (Austria): Since Austria has the honour to chair the 1991 session of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation would like to introduce the relevant draft resolution (A/C.1/46/L.3).

The draft resolution refers to the report of the Disarmament Commission on its 1991 substantive session, the first session to take place after the Disarmament Commission's reform, adopted in "Ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission". Thus, the form and content of the draft resolution reflect the implementation of the Disarmament Commission's reform programme and the progress achieved under its reformed structure.

(Mr. Stelzer, Austria)

The 1991 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission took place during a crucial phase in the history of arms control and disarmament. The end of a period of extreme bipolarization of security concerns and the subsequent democratization of international relations require a rapid adaptation of old dogmas to new realities. Furthermore, the implementation of the disarmament agreement negotiated within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) has highlighted the possible impact of a regional process on global security issues.

Consequently, the traditional pattern of the domination of global issues and the dependency of regional aspects, within which regional conflicts often reflected the global division of the East-West conflict, has been questioned. This results in a new emphasis on regional aspects of security. Shortly after the regional conference in Europe had initiated a process of sustainable cooperation of two formerly antagonistic military blocs, the conflict in the Gulf - at its outset regional in its military dimension - unified the community of nations and mobilized a global effort to solve the regional problem.

Thus, including the issue of regional approaches in the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission's 1991 substantive session was very timely. The agenda items on objective information on military matters, the process of nuclear disarmament, and the role of science and technology in the context of international security complemented an agenda which could hardly have been more up to date.

When the Disarmament Commission met for its 1991 substantive session, important preconditions for a cooperative security policy at a global level

(Mr. Stelzer, Austria)

were in existence and the substantial deliberations in the four working groups were inspired by an improved understanding of global responsibilities. Progress on the agenda item entitled "Objective information on military matters", a better understanding of the regional aspect of disarmament and an appropriate analysis of the complex issue of science and technology in the context of international security were considered to be most important for the enhancement of international security and the advancement of the disarmament agenda.

The 1991 session of the Disarmament Commission was not expected to produce concrete results in the form of clear recommendations on its agenda items. Given a maximum of three consecutive years to elaborate and, consequently, to submit recommendations on each of the four items on its agenda, this year's substantive session of the Commission was required to accelerate progress towards disarmament by defining all possible aspects of the agenda items, thus preparing for a future consensus on possible recommendations.

The sponsors of the draft resolutions, representing all regional groups, agree on the assessment that the 1991 session of the Commission made considerable progress. Most of the working groups have made substantial progress in the task of formulating recommendations. Although it might be premature to assess the implicit degree of consensus already existing, positions expressed in numerous statements indicated that on many items progress seems to have stopped just short of consensus. As was mentioned in concluding statements, the prospect of another two years at the Commission's

(Mr. Stelzer, Austria)

disposal for deliberations on three agenda items and one more year for the issue of objective information might have diverted efforts from an uncompromising striving for speedy results. This might also have provoked the temporary resurgence of regional interest and the taking of traditional positions which had seemed to have been overcome.

(Mr. Stelzer, Austria)

While operative paragraph 2 of the proposed draft resolution assesses the considerable progress achieved by this year's United Nations Disarmament Commission, most of the operative part deals with the future work of the Commission. The matters specified in the four agenda items which the Disarmament Commission should be mandated to address during 1992 are based on last year's consensus. The remaining paragraphs, on organizational aspects, do not deviate from hitherto generally accepted traditions.

The sponsors of the draft resolution on the Report of the Disarmament Commission anticipate that the resolution will obtain a consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Mexico to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.12.

Mrs. CARVALHO (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): It is now generally accepted that we are living in a new era of international relations. The disappearance of military confrontation between the two great Powers and the changes in the main military alliances and their doctrines have made for conditions conducive to progress in disarmament negotiations which, in previous times, were beyond the reach of the international community.

The Conference on Disarmament has none the less not made substantive progress on most items of its agenda, including the comprehensive programme of disarmament. The comprehensive approach to disarmament, designed to achieve the goal of general and complete disarmament, should have greater opportunities for success today than in the past.

Nobody today would agree to leaving disarmament tasks to bilateral or regional efforts alone. We welcome the achievement of partial disarmament measures but we consider it necessary to have a general framework covering all

(Mrs. Carvalho, Mexico)

steps that may appear to be advisable in order to achieve orderly multilateral negotiations agreed by all. This would undoubtedly facilitate our work and provide a better understanding of the various initiatives that have recently been undertaken at different levels. One of the current concerns of the international community has been to strengthen the United Nations role with regard to international peace and security. A comprehensive disarmament programme under the auspices of the United Nations would contribute to that goal.

We believe that we must safeguard the work done during 10 years of negotiations and give ourselves the opportunity to make adjustments to the texts already agreed and solve pending problems in the light of new realities and prospects.

A few days ago the representative of Argentina was reflecting in this very forum on the need to develop a new, operative disarmament agenda setting out specific objectives. The comprehensive programme of disarmament could very well encompass all the initiatives to which he referred but which have not yet found their place in the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.12 "Comprehensive programme of disarmament" - Bolivia, Indonesia, Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Mexico - consider that now, more than ever before, the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should be resumed at the beginning of the 1992 session of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The General Assembly, since the adoption of resolution 3264 (XXIX), has considered it necessary to take whatever measures might be needed to

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

"prohibit action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, which are incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health". (resolution 3264 (XXIX), para. 1)

In response to this concern on the part of the international community, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament adopted a multilateral instrument to regulate these issues, which gave rise to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (ENMOD), concluded in 1977 and in force since 1978. As the representative of Finland recalled this morning, 54 States have ratified the ENMOD Convention, and 17 signatory States are awaiting ratification. That is a clear demonstration of how important it is to stress the necessity of universal adherence to this instrument.

The negotiations in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament showed, as is normal in any process of this type, that there were various approaches to the problem. Some delegations, including those of Argentina and other members of the Group of 21, advocated a prohibition that would be as broad as possible, with the text of the Convention containing a complete ban on environmental warfare instead of a limited prohibition on damage described as "having widespread, long-lasting or severe effects" - the wording used in article 1 of the ENMOD Convention. The ENMOD Convention therefores leaves open disturbing possibilities, particularly as regards the scale of damage and the very definition of the expression "environmental modification techniques". This flexibility in its text could lead to different

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

interpretations as to the evaluation of the consequences of such hostile actions. The recent Gulf conflict can serve as evidence of this.

It is not my delegation's intention to analyse this instrument at the present session; rather, we wish to point out that, with the community of nations increasingly concerned about and aware of the requirements of the environment in all fields, we are in complete agreement with the objectives of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/46/L.5, submitted this morning by the delegation of Finland, which so efficiently chaired the First Review Conference of the Convention.

Mrs. URIBE DE LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): A number of countries have warned for some time now that the modernization and accumulation of conventional weapons, including delivery systems - having taken on their present proportions and qualitative characteristics through transfers and constant production of these weapons as well as their illicit traffic - have a perilous effect on relations among States and represent one of the gravest obstacles to the establishment of a just and peaceful international order.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23, which we are introducing today on behalf of Peru and Colombia, entitled "International arms transfers", recognizes this fact and reaffirms the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the commitment of Member States to adopt concrete measures to strengthen that role. The draft also recalls that the final document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, urged major arms recipient and supplier States to consult on the limitation of all types of international transfers of conventional arms.

Our task must be to seek disarmament and should include action to avoid weapons transfers and production leading to excessive accumulation; we must also adopt concrete international measures making it possible to reduce and limit arms transfers, as well as to eradicate illicit arms traffic.

On that basis, the draft resolution calls upon Member States to give high priority to eradicating illicit arms traffic. It also urges, invites, and calls upon States to take various measures, including regional and international cooperation towards that end.

The growing illicit arms traffic is an integral part of an arms trade that involves war, terrorism, organized crime, drug trafficking and mercenary

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

greed - factors that cross oceans and continents and adapt to the widest range of diverse situations. For years, we have called the attention of the international community to the consequences of this traffic as a phenomenon that not only exacerbates tensions and threatens national and regional security but has the potential to threaten international peace and security as well.

In this draft resolution, we urge Member States to take all necessary steps to develop an appropriate set of laws and the administrative machinery needed to exert effective control over their arms and military equipment and over their arms imports and exports, so as to prevent these arms from reaching those who conduct illicit trade. Towards that end we also urge States to strengthen existing laws or adopt strict measures for their enforcement, and to cooperate at the international, regional and subregional levels to harmonize relevant laws and administrative procedures, as well as their enforcement measures.

Despite the consequences for many countries that have been victims of this illicit trade, we know more about its impact on society than about the nature of the trade itself. We therefore believe it is important for the countries affected to compile, within the United Nations, information on arms that have been seized by the authorities. That data - to be provided to the Secretary-General - would constitute an analytic basis for exploring ways of eliminating illicit arms traffic.

By the same token, States should provide the Secretary-General with information regarding their policies, laws and administrative procedures with respect to arms exports, imports and procurement, in regard to both the

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

authorization of arms transfers and the prevention of illicit transfers. In this draft resolution we invite Member States to provide such information.

In its sections on illicit arms transfers, the Secretary-General's study recommends specific measures that Member States must take to eliminate this traffic and also gives the United Nations a role to play in the struggle against it. The study welcomes the holding of seminars and meetings to increase awareness of the destructive and destabilizing effects of illicit arms traffic and to deepen understanding of the policies in effect in different countries, so as to facilitate their cooperation.

Since illicit arms traffic is by nature clandestine, it cannot be controlled through a register of arms transfers as proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18. For that reason, the draft's sponsors believe that the actions States could take and the ways States could cooperate to eradicate illicit arms traffic should be considered in the Disarmament Commission as soon as possible.

There is no need now to repeat what we have said so many times about the scourge that is illicit arms traffic and the violence it generates. Suffice it to say that the Secretary-General's study condemns such traffic, and that, in accordance with recommendations in that study, measures should be undertaken to eliminate it. We believe that this draft resolution may constitute a step in that direction, and that is why we ask all Governments represented here to give it their support.

(Mrs. Uribe de Lozano, Colombia)

I want to take this opportunity to express thanks for the co-sponsorship of Costa Rica and Bolivia, as well as that of Romania, which has just been announced. I appreciate, too, the support expressed for this draft resolution by a number of other delegations. It encourages us even further in our endeavours to have the draft adopted by consensus.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
29th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 6 November 1991
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MROZIEWICZ (Poland)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of and action on draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items (continued)

- Programme of work

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

91-61688 7204V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.29
14 November 1991

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the European Community and its member States, I should like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.22, entitled "Confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe". This draft resolution has been submitted jointly by the Twelve and is co-sponsored by all the States Members of the United Nations that are taking part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), as well as by Belarus and Ukraine.

This text, which is a sequel to resolutions 43/75 P of 1988, 44/116 I of 1989 and 45/58 I of 1990, concerns the results to date and the continuation of the Vienna negotiations taking place in the framework of the CSCE - one set of negotiations relating to conventional armed forces in Europe and the other relating to confidence- and security-building measures in Europe.

Last year the General Assembly welcomed the signing in Paris, on 19 November 1990, of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and the adoption at the CSCE Paris summit on 17 November 1990 of the Vienna Document on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures in Europe.

The Twelve are pleased that it has been possible to remove the obstacles that had arisen on the way to the ratification of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. This should lead to the rapid and complete implementation of that important Treaty. The Twelve are convinced that the

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

implementation of the Treaty and the confidence- and security-building measures agreed upon by the States participating in the CSCE will contribute to reinforcing not only security and stability on the European continent, but also international peace and security world-wide.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

The decision taken by the States involved - first, to continue the current negotiations and, secondly, to prepare for the negotiations that are to follow the Helsinki summit meeting in 1992 - constitutes a further step in establishing a new security order in Europe. That new security order must continue to be based on the process provided by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), which, more than ever, constitutes an important element of stability at a time when the continent is going through considerable but positive upheavals - sometimes, unfortunately, involving conflict. The Twelve hope that, as in the past, the draft resolution they are submitting will be adopted by consensus.

(spoke in English)

I should now like to make some comments on the issue of conventional disarmament, again speaking on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community.

The Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament states:

> "Together with negotiations on nuclear disarmament measures, the limitation and gradual reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons should be resolutely pursued within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament." (S-10/2, para. 81)

Without doubt, nuclear disarmament has received a tremendous boost from the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (the INF Treaty) and the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START). Conventional disarmament has also seen major progress through the signing in Paris of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe in November 1990. The process of conventional arms control and disarmament in Europe is continuing. Questions such as the reduction of manpower levels and stabilizing measures

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

are being considered. After the 1992 follow-up meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe new negotiations on disarmament and on confidence-building and security-building are to begin between all CSCE participating States.

The increasing attention being given conventional disarmament is to be welcomed. Since the Second World War conventional weapons have caused an enormous number of casualties. But it is not simply the high number of casualties that should induce States to embark on a process of conventional disarmament. More than anything else, the Gulf War has shown that the international community does not accept the use of armed aggression to solve disputes. Acquiring vast arsenals of conventional weapons in quantities that clearly go beyond the needs of defence and exerting efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction simply do not pay and will eventually lead to disaster. States should base their defence policies on military capability sufficient for individual or collective self-defence. They should not resort to the threat or use of force to settle differences. The principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes should be upheld and reconfirmed.

The Twelve have on a number of occasions in the past elaborated on the necessity to embark on conventional disarmament. The European model is not one for all regions to follow in all its aspects, but it is precisely because the Twelve are only too aware of the difficulties of embarking on a process of conventional disarmament that they cannot but urge others to begin without delay.

Last year's session of the General Assembly was positive in that sense as well, as can be seen in resolution 45/58 G, which was adopted by consensus and which stated that it would be welcome if the Conference on Disarmament were to address the issue of conventional disarmament when practicable. It is noted

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

that the Conference on Disarmament has not yet included conventional disarmament on its operative agenda.

The European example shows that conventional disarmament cannot be viewed in isolation. Breakthroughs and progress occur when political circumstances allow for such potential developments. States should therefore strive to reduce the risk of conflict.

The political will to settle disputes peacefully and the adoption of confidence-building measures can be conducive to disarmament measures. Openness and transparency should be the first priority and an essential step towards creating a climate of confidence. States should concentrate their efforts first on establishing stability, in particular by eliminating the capability to launch surprise attacks and large-scale offensive operations. The objective of conventional disarmament measures should be increased security at the lowest-possible level of armaments and military forces.

In the future, conventional disarmament will certainly get a tremendous boost from the increased transparency of international arms transactions, if this body indeed agrees on the establishment of an international arms-transfer register under the auspices of the United Nations.

It should of course be clear that weapons and equipment that are the subjects of a conventional-forces reductions agreement should not be transferred, either directly or indirectly, to States not parties to the agreement in question. The principal method of dealing with such reductions should be the destruction of such weapons and equipment.

A clearer insight into each other's military capabilities will help States to embark on disarmament efforts focused on systems that are perceived to be particularly threatening and, by that very nature, destabilizing.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

The subject of conventional arms control and disarmament should be kept at the forefront of the multilateral debate on disarmament. Further consideration should be given to the subject of conventional disarmament in the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. The Twelve stand ready to provide any assistance and expertise they have gained.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13 concerning the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, together with three protocols on non-detectable fragments, on land-mines, booby traps and other devices and on incendiary weapons.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

After many years of negotiations the Convention was opened for signature in April 1981 and the Secretary-General of the United Nations was designated as the Depositary.

The adoption of the Convention was the result of several years of laborious work. The fact that it had already entered into force in December 1983 was an encouraging indication of the wish of the international community progressively to develop international humanitarian law in the field of conventional weaponry and to give it effect. The draft resolution reflects the satisfaction felt at this positive development but it also notes the need for a wider ratification of the Convention and the three annexed Protocols. The draft resolution urges States that have not yet become parties to the Convention and its annexed Protocols to exert their best endeavours to do so as early as possible so that the instruments might ultimately obtain universal adherence. The draft resolution also notes the potential of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to consider questions pursuant to the Convention.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia and my own country, Sweden. On behalf of the sponsors, I should like to express the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13 will be adopted without a vote.

Speaking on behalf of my own delegation, I should like to make the following additional remarks. According to paragraph 3 of article 8 of the Convention, a review or amendment conference can be convened 10 years

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

following the entry into force of the Convention, that is, in 1993. Sweden considers that the appropriateness of such a conference should now be actively considered with a view to taking a decision during the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly. In the opinion of my country, some weapons categories, like incendiary weapons, should be subjected to further specific restrictions. It is also our opinion that naval mines should be the object of restrictions in a new protocol, preferably within the framework of the present Convention. The Swedish Government presented a draft protocol on this subject at the meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in May 1989 (A/CN.10/141). Sweden now intends to present and circulate as an official United Nations document a new version of the draft protocol introduced in 1989. My delegation hopes that it will be issued in the next few days. It is, like the earlier version, elaborated on the basis of the concepts of neutralizing mechanisms and information, concepts already incorporated in the eighth Hague Convention and the second Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices, attached to the United Nations Convention on certain conventional weapons. The new version is the product of consultations among a small number of international experts acting in their personal capacity. The text differs from the earlier one in that the reference to torpedoes is deleted and the draft protocol is presented as an additional protocol attached to the United Nations Convention on certain conventional weapons. Other changes are basically of a drafting nature. We hope that the up-dated version will serve as a useful basis for further deliberations.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

In addition, developments in laser technology should, in the view of my delegation, be followed closely. There is a clear risk of the development of lasers for anti-personnel purposes on the conventional battlefield. It is then technically possible to develop and manufacture specific laser weapons, the main effect of which would be to blind the adversary's soldiers permanently. Such anti-eye laser weapons may yield certain military advantages but, on balance, taking into account humanitarian considerations, it seems that such lasers should be subject to prohibitions or restrictions on their use either in a new protocol annexed to the United Nations Convention or by some other means. Swedish experts have continually consulted with other experts in the field during the last few years and have participated in several expert meetings, many of them organized by the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Sweden attaches great importance to the further development of international humanitarian law in armed conflicts. Many of these questions will, it is hoped, be widely discussed during the twenty-sixth international conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent that will take place in Budapest, Hungary, from 29 November to 6 December this year.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): Ten years ago last year a United Nations Conference in Geneva adopted the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.

All along the Netherlands has been a strong supporter of the goals and objectives of the Convention. In our view, therefore, States should be

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

encouraged to become parties. The wider the adherence to the Convention, the stronger will be the international norm that is laid down in the Convention.

We believe that an added advantage of the Convention is that it induces States to reflect and to weigh the military effectiveness of certain weapons against humanitarian considerations. Thus the Convention, besides prohibiting or restricting certain types of weapons, may also lead States to think twice before acquiring or using them.

On behalf of my delegation, I should like fully to endorse and support the introductory statement just made by my colleague from Sweden on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13. The Netherlands expresses the hope that the Convention will in future command universal adherence. Such a call is also made in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13 which, in operative paragraph 3:

> "Urges all States that have not yet done so to exert their best endeavours to become parties to the Convention and the Protocols annexed thereto as early as possible, so as ultimately to obtain universality of adherence." (A/C.1/46/L.13)

Such universal adherence - or at least wide adherence - would strengthen the authority of the Convention. The international community should look at ways and means to achieve this goal.

One possibility could be the medium of a review conference. Indeed, reviewing the operation of the Convention might help to focus international attention on this important instrument of international humanitarian law. The Convention itself states that a review conference can be convened 10 years after its entry into force: that would mean in 1993.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

The Netherlands believes that the possibility of convening a review conference should be seriously considered in the time to come and in the appropriate forums, for example during the forthcoming General Conference of the International Committee of the Red Cross in Budapest.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

Non-members can attend such a review conference as observers. Interest in the Convention and awareness of its merits would thus be increased. These may be only modest steps on the road towards universality, but they should not be underestimated either. The General Assembly at its present session can give an added impetus by again adopting draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.13 by consensus.

Mr. HANSELMANN (Norway): My delegation would like to make some brief comments regarding the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, and its three Protocols. The Convention was the product of many years of consideration by the international community - in particular the United Nations and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) - aimed at prohibiting or restricting the use of specific conventional weapons which could have unnecessarily injurious effects. In Norway's view, the Convention represents a successful attempt at developing humanitarian law in the field of disarmament, intended to protect civilians and reduce the suffering of victims of armed conflict.

The draft resolution on this issue, which is contained in document A/C.1/46/L.13, just introduced by Sweden, and of which my country is a sponsor, emphasizes that article 8 of the Convention deals inter alia with the question of amendments or new protocols. A conference may, according to that article, be convened to review the scope and operation of the Convention and to consider additional protocols relating to other categories of conventional weapons not covered by the existing Protocols.

(Mr. Hanselmann, Norway)

If a proposal for such a conference is made, Norway would like to stress that the issue should be subject to broad consultations, in particular with regard to new categories of weapons which one might wish to include.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to urge countries that have not yet done so to become parties to the Convention and its Protocols. The aim should clearly be universal participation.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to make a brief statement under agenda item 50 concerning the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

The French arms-control and disarmament plan, introduced on 3 June 1991 (A/46/212), on which my delegation will make another statement, recalls that preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons is an urgent task, which is in the vital interest of all States, both North and South. It is in that spirit that France has announced its decision to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). As the French Minister of Foreign Affairs announced to the General Assembly, our instruments of accession to the Treaty will be deposited before the end of this year.

It is also in that spirit that France took note with satisfaction of the decision of some countries in Latin America - in particular Argentina, Brazil and Chile - to take measures with a view to speeding the full entry into force of the Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America. Indeed, France has always stated that it would neither anticipate the decisions of the countries of the region with regard to the entry into force of the Treaty nor do anything to delay its entry into force.

(Mr. Errera, France)

In view of these developments, I wish to announce here that France is giving positive consideration to the possibility of ratifying Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Mexico wishes to refer to agenda item 50 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean, known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco. As members are doubtless aware, the Treaty already has 23 States parties from among the 33 independent States of the region. Moreover, in Additional Protocol II, the five nuclear-weapon Powers have undertaken to respect the nuclear-weapon-free status of Latin America and the Caribbean and have undertaken not to use, nor threaten to use, nuclear weapons against the parties to the Treaty.

At the same time, there are in the area of application of the Treaty certain territories which, although not sovereign political entities, are none the less in a position to receive the benefits deriving from the Treaty through its Additional Protocol I, to which the four States that de jure or de facto are internationally responsible for those territories may become parties. Those States are the United States, France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom became a party to that Protocol in 1969, the Netherlands in 1971, and the United States in 1981. The only one still missing is France, which signed the Protocol in 1979 but has not yet ratified it.

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

This fact accounts for the urgent appeals of the General Assembly and also for the draft resolution now before the Committee in document A/C.1/46/L.2.

On behalf of the 18 sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.2, we wish to point out that we have listened most attentively to the statement just made by the representative of France to the effect that his Government is prepared to give serious consideration to the ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Such ratification would bring to a close a very lengthy chapter in the history of efforts to secure the full effect of the Treaty. We thank the representative of France for the information he has given us and we welcome the step which his Government seems prepared to take.

In the light of the foregoing, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.2 will not - I respect, will not - insist on having a vote taken on the draft resolution, and we hereby withdraw it. Instead, we request the First Committee to decide to include the following item on the provisional agenda of the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session: "Signature and ratification of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean - the Treaty of Tlatelolco - and of its two Additional Protocols".

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Mexico has, therefore, withdrawn draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.2 and expressed the intention of submitting a draft decision on the same subject, to be circulated officially. I believe that the Committee will agree with that procedure.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Costa Rica, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.34.

Mrs. CASTRO DE BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): As this is the first time that my delegation has spoken in the First Committee, I take special pleasure in congratulating you on your unanimous election to the chairmanship of this Committee at this forty-sixth session, not just because of your professional and personal qualities, but also because you represent Poland, a country which Costa Rica has always admired. We also offer our congratulations to your fellow officers of the Committee.

I now have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/46/L.34, entitled "Education and information for disarmament". The text is for the most part in line with resolution 44/123, adopted on 15 December 1989, the purpose of which was to continue the follow-up to paragraph 106 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly (resolution S-10/2), referred to in the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. Emphasis is also laid on the importance of paragraphs 99, 100 and 101 of the Final Document, which provide a whole range of concrete and positive recommendations for mobilizing world public opinion in favour of disarmament and drawing attention to the special importance of giving greater publicity to the Final Document.

Stress is also laid on the importance of the World Disarmament Campaign as a valuable adjunct to educational efforts promoting disarmament, and we

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

would furthermore like to stress an obvious point, albeit one that needs emphasis, which is that if irreversible results in this venture are to be obtained, training programmes must be developed at all levels of formal education so as to alter basic attitudes to aggression, violence, armaments and war. This idea brings to mind the preamble to the UNESCO constitution, which states, inter alia, that "since wars began in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed".

We are glad to note the unprecedented changes that have taken place in many parts of the world, aimed at promoting freedom, democracy, respect for and enjoyment of human rights, and social and economic development. In the present circumstances we cannot fail to take account of these positive and encouraging facts, and we have therefore referred to them in the last paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

We cannot treat disarmament exclusively as a political and technological problem, ignoring the fact that the artifacts of death and destruction, whether nuclear, conventional, chemical or bacteriological, in fact all weapons of mass destruction, victimize human beings and other living creatures and destroy the ecological systems. It is for this reason that we believe the reference to it in our draft resolution is relevant and necessary.

In the operative part of the resolution thanks is expressed to the Secretary-General for his report, submitted in response to resolution 44/123, and for the valuable information it contains, provided by Member States, international governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and educational institutions for peace and disarmament.

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

In operative paragraph 4 we emphasize the vital objectives of the World Disarmament Campaign: to inform, educate and generate understanding of and support for the goals of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament.

In operative paragraph 5 Member States and governmental and non-governmental organizations and educational institutions for peace and disarmament are invited to redouble their efforts to respond to the appeal made in paragraph 106 of the Final Document and to submit to the Secretary-General a report on their activities in that regard.

Lastly, the Secretary-General is requested to submit the reports requested in operative paragraph 5 to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session, under the item entitled "Education and information for disarmament".

We are grateful to the sponsors of this draft resolution for having supported us in this endeavour. They are: Bolivia, Canada, Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, the Marshall Islands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay and Venezuela - now joined, as I have just been informed, by India, Ireland, Peru, Togo and Uruguay. We would also be very grateful to the members of the First Committee for a favourable response to our initiative. We very much trust that it will prove possible to adopt it without a vote.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to inform the Committee that on Friday, 8 November, the Committee will begin to take action on draft resolutions under the disarmament agenda items. As indicated earlier, draft resolutions will be taken up cluster by cluster.

(The Chairman)

On Friday, decisions will begin to be taken on cluster 1, comprising resolutions A/C.1/46/L.1, L.3, L.5, L.8, L.10, L.13, L.26, L.33 and L.39. Thereafter, time permitting, we shall proceed on the same day to take action on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 2, namely A/C.1/46/L.15 and L.40.

The meeting was rose at 4.10 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Thursday, 7 November 1991
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. MROZIEWICZ	(Poland)
later:	Mr. ALPMAN (Vice-Chairman)	(Turkey)

CONTENTS

Consideration of and action on draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

91-61706 7212V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.30
15 November 1991

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee for an announcement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have joined in sponsoring the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8: Afghanistan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9: Bulgaria, Turkey and Uruguay;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.16: Singapore;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.17: Afghanistan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19: Afghanistan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.22: Malta;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.23: Afghanistan, Costa Rica and Venezuela;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.25: Afghanistan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.27: Bulgaria;

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.33: Sweden; and

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/1.34: Ireland, Spain, Togo and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Mexico, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.1.

Mr. HERNANDEZ BASAVE (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): This session is taking place at a time of rapid and profound change in the world political situation. The cold-war period is behind us for ever; this has provided the international community with great opportunities to move forward towards the establishment of an effective system of peace and security.

The arms-reduction and arms-elimination agreements reached in recent years by the two super-Powers and the unilateral measures recently announced by the Presidents of the United States and the Soviet Union give us reason to hope that this is at last the beginning of an authentic disarmament process that could enable mankind to live free of the fear of total destruction by nuclear weapons.

Therefore, it is more urgent than ever that the United Nations not lag behind in the sphere of disarmament. Revitalizing multilateral disarmament negotiations is of greater urgency than ever, and we must endeavour to achieve this. To reach that objective, it is most important that public opinion be well informed.

It is particularly important that government officials, the mass media, non-governmental organizations, educators, academic research institutions and elected representatives know, understand and support the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

For that reason, the World Disarmament Campaign launched in 1982 by the General Assembly had the primary objectives of informing, of educating and of generating public understanding of and support for the objectives of the United Nations in the area of disarmament and arms control. Since its

(Mr. Hernandez Basave, Mexico)

inception the Campaign has focused on organizing conferences and regional meetings, on a broad programme of publications and on the holding of special events such as Disarmament Week, which always begins on 24 October, United Nations Day.

The rapidity and intensity of the current process of change makes it vital that we have balanced and objective information on the vast possibilities of the United Nations with respect to the establishment of a system of international security based on mutual trust, enabling us to move forward in a genuine process of disarmament, and especially in the area of nuclear disarmament.

It is my honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.1, entitled "World Disarmament Campaign", under agenda item 61 (d). I do so on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Egypt, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mongolia, Myanmar, Peru, the Philippines, Romania, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico. For the reasons I have stated, the draft resolution recommends in its paragraph 4 that the Campaign further focus its efforts on activities to foster informed debate on arms limitation, disarmament and international security.

In the draft resolution the General Assembly would welcome the report of the Secretary-General on the World Disarmament Campaign. In paragraph 5 the Assembly would invite all Member States to contribute to the World Disarmament Campaign Voluntary Trust Fund, and in paragraph 6 it would decide that at its forty-seventh session there should be a tenth United Nations Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign and would express the hope that

(Mr. Hernandez Basave, Mexico)

on that occasion all those Member States which have not yet announced any voluntary contributions would do so.

In paragraph 8 the Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of the forty-seventh session the item entitled "World Disarmament Campaign", a title agreed by consensus in 1982 - the sole tangible result of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

As in 1990, the text of the draft resolution omits points that in the past had been of concern to some delegations, which demonstrates the flexibility of the sponsors. Indeed, this text was revised last year and was adopted without a vote at the forty-fifth session. For that reason, the sponsors of the draft resolution trust that once again it can be adopted without a vote by this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Canada, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.11, A/C.1/46/L.15 and A/C.1/46/L.36.

Ms. MASON (Canada): I have the honour and privilege today to introduce first draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons". In addition to Canada and Poland, the following 42 Member States are also sponsors: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

A number of major developments have taken place in the last year that have significantly affected the circumstances in which the negotiations are taking place in Geneva on a convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction. I will not comment on those details now except to suggest that their cumulative impact has been such as to make more urgent than ever before the need for such a convention. Perhaps the single most important positive development, however, has been the decision of the negotiators to intensify, as a priority task, their negotiations with a view to striving to achieve a final agreement on the convention by 1992.

Given that major development, the sponsors of the draft resolution concluded that it would be appropriate for the text to highlight the importance of that decision. Moreover, as the negotiations are entering their final phase, we considered that it would also be appropriate to introduce other changes to the text to underline the essential message that the negotiations should be completed next year. By establishing clear and strongly focused expectations for the negotiations, the General Assembly could make a significant contribution to their success.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

Accordingly, the draft resolution differs in a number of significant ways from that adopted at last year's session of the General Assembly, as follows.

First, we have slightly amended the first preambular paragraph to include the phrase "and use", in reflection of the Conference on Disarmament's decision to amend the negotiating mandate so as to cover the "use" aspect.

Second, we have amended the third preambular paragraph to take particular note of the Conference on Disarmament's changed mandate.

Third, in recognition of the importance of this decision, we have added a new operative paragraph 3 to commend the Conference for its decision, which we think every Member State will applaud.

Fourth, we have amended operative paragraph 4 so as to underline this body's support for concluding the negotiations as soon as possible in 1992.

Fifth, as a further illustration of the international community's resolve finally to achieve a convention, we have introduced new language in the fourth preambular paragraph to take note of the fact that the States participating in the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention inter alia declared themselves in favour of the early conclusion of the negotiations.

Sixth, given our concern that the draft resolution should focus as much as possible on the desire to conclude the negotiations, we considered the several, diverse preambular paragraphs and came to the conclusion that the elements addressed in many of them might now be taken for granted as already being factored into the negotiations, and that these paragraphs might therefore be deleted. However, in recognition of the importance attached by States to these elements, we slightly amended operative paragraph 7 to take

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

account of the various initiatives taken in support of the negotiations and to urge further such initiatives to achieve rapid agreement in the negotiations on, and universal adherence to, the convention.

Seventh, in the same vein, we have added language to the final preambular paragraph that takes note of the statements made by groups of States in the last 12 months concerning the issue of declarations of intent to become original signatories to the convention.

Eighth, and finally, in support of the goals of the convention - in particular, the desirability of universal adherence - we have amended operative paragraph 8 to call upon all States to consider declaring their intention to become original States parties. In making such a call, we are aware that some members of this body are concerned to ensure that their rights and responsibilities, in particular their constitutional responsibilities to their parliaments, are duly taken account of.

We are convinced that the language proposed - in particular, the call on States to "consider" such declarations - affords the necessary protection of these rights and responsibilities. The draft resolution contains no implication that States can or should take actions that override their constitutions.

The draft resolution before the Committee is the result of broad consultations among several delegations, all of which have demonstrated a gratifying degree of cooperation and good will. In this regard, I particularly wish to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to you, Sir, and your delegation for your close collaboration in preparing the draft resolution. We also sincerely appreciate the constructive support and

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

cooperation shown by all the other sponsors, as well as other delegations, in elaborating this draft. We regard this cooperation as an encouraging sign of the universal wish to realize finally the long-desired goal of a convention on chemical weapons.

For the past several years, a similar draft resolution has enjoyed the unanimous support of the Member States of this body. The spirit of cooperation shown by all in the development of this year's draft encourages us to believe that Member States will once again wish to adopt the draft resolution by consensus. In doing so, the Member States will demonstrate the keen desire we all feel to achieve the convention, and will send a strong message to the negotiators of the support of the entire international community for finalizing their work in 1992.

I now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.11.

The Canadian delegation is pleased to introduce again the draft resolution entitled "Prohibition of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes", contained this year in document A/C.1/46/L.11. This draft resolution is sponsored by Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Botswana, Cameroon, Denmark, Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Sweden, Uruguay and Canada. This group represents States from every continent.

I wish to draw the attention of representatives to two substantive changes to the draft resolution from the resolution (45/58L) adopted on the subject at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The fourth paragraph is new, and has been included to give appropriate recognition to the important developments over recent months in the area of nuclear disarmament,

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

notably the conclusion of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty and the unilateral nuclear-weapon initiatives subsequently announced by President Bush and President Gorbachev. These developments are of relevance to the goal of a prohibition on the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, and, indeed, enhance prospects for the realization of this goal.

The second change is found in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. In this paragraph the Conference on Disarmament is now requested "to continue to pursue its consideration" of adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons. This wording acknowledges that the issue has been the subject of consideration at the Conference on Disarmament, in the form of interventions by representatives, while encouraging the Conference on Disarmament to continue its consideration. It is for the members of the Conference on Disarmament to decide, of course, how they wish to consider this subject.

Apart from these changes, the focus of this procedural draft resolution remains substantively unchanged from resolution 45/58 L. Canada urges all delegations to lend their support to this draft resolution, which the sponsors hope will be adopted with broad support.

I now turn to consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.15.

On behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, Nigeria and Sweden and my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce the text of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.15, on the subject of the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons.

Canada had the privilege this year of chairing the Conference on Disarmament's Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons and of working closely

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

with other Conference on Disarmament delegations - in particular, the Bulgarian and Nigerian coordinators of the discussions on tracks A and B - in considering further relevant texts and elements. As the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Mr. Robertson, noted in his statement to the Conference on 15 August last, we were particularly pleased with the very positive, cooperative and professional spirit displayed by all delegations, which we regard as having been a major factor in the constructive work carried out this year. In our view, progress was achieved on both tracks, but particularly on track A, where a potentially significant alternative proposal on scope and definitions was added to the text of the draft articles for a convention. In addition, new agreed texts were elaborated for other elements of the draft convention.

Further intensive work will, of course, be necessary on both tracks to enable the Conference to proceed effectively. To this end, we strongly support the recommendation that the Ad Hoc Committee be re-established at the beginning of its 1992 session.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

The draft resolution before the Committee is a very straightforward one; essentially it takes note of the work carried out this year and the recommendation by the Conference on Disarmament for the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee at its 1992 session and encourages the Conference to continue its work expeditiously. It is thus very similar to previous resolutions of the General Assembly. In past years, those resolutions have enjoyed the unanimous support of all Member States. We therefore hope that Member States will once again wish to adopt this resolution by consensus.

Lastly, I should like to take this opportunity to speak with regard to a Canadian bibliography on arms-control verification.

Delegations may recall that in November 1990 Canada promised to continue making contributions to the United Nations consolidated database on all aspects of verification and compliance. That promise was made in response to the adoption of the consensus report on verification by the group of qualified governmental experts, a report which called inter alia for contributions to the consolidated database by Member States.

I am pleased to announce that we are making available today a detailed bibliography on arms-control verification covering more than 1,500 entries, from 1962 to 1991. Copies of that text are now available at the back of the room. More detail on the background to this Canadian contribution is included in the accompanying letter to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Akashi.

As I said in my opening statement to this Committee, Canada hopes that other States will be able to make similar contributions in order to assist the United Nations in its efforts.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Canada for the kind words she addressed to the Polish delegation and for the outstanding work which has been done in order to put together the bibliography, which I think is very important.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): Mr. Chairman, may I commence by supporting and echoing your comment commending the Canadian delegation for the excellent work on the bibliography on arms control which they are circulating today.

I take pleasure this morning in presenting to the Committee a draft resolution on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, contained in document A/C.1/46/L.16. It has a wide group of sponsors and is directed at supporting measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. That Protocol remains the major international norm against the use of chemical weapons. It continues to be the central concern of the sponsors that the authority of the Protocol should be enhanced pending the conclusion of a comprehensive chemical-weapons convention. Indeed, because that convention still has not been concluded, Australia decided, after consultation with a wide group of countries, that it was worth while to present another draft resolution on the subject in 1991.

In framing the draft resolution this year, we have drawn largely on elements from a similar consensus resolution in 1990, General Assembly resolution 45/57 C. We have modified the contents of that resolution to reflect the events of the past year.

This year's draft resolution recalls the previous condemnation of the use of chemical weapons and deplores all threats, especially those made most recently, of the use of chemical weapons. The draft resolution also repeats

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

the vigorous condemnation of actions that violate or threaten to violate the 1925 Protocol; renews the call to all States to observe that Protocol; welcomes recent decisions, declarations and initiatives of the United Nations aimed at upholding the authority of the Protocol; and supports activities by regional and international disarmament conferences and decisions by national Governments aimed at hastening the conclusion of the chemical-weapons convention as a step towards the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction.

The framing of such a resolution after the events of 1991 has not been an easy task. The balanced nature of the text reflects the views of many different nations. Nevertheless, we believe that in today's circumstances it makes a helpful and substantial contribution to the Gereral Assembly's consideration of this subject. It is a contemporary expression of our determination to avoid the use or the threat of use of chemical weapons by observing the principles of the 1925 Protocol.

May I take this opportunity to thank the wide and very representative group of sponsors, Bolivia, Chile and Singapore being the most recent. I also thank the many other countries which have indicated support for this draft resolution, and I wish to encourage those States which have not yet done so to add their names to the list of sponsors, so that the international community will be seen to be continuing to enhance the norms against the use or threat of use of chemical weapons. We commend the draft resolution to the Assembly for adoption by consensus.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): On behalf of the European Community and its member States, I wish to go on record concerning item 59 of our agenda, on Chemical and Bacteriological (Biological) Weapons.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

The negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva on a multilateral convention on the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction have made substantial progress this year.

The year started with some difficult political issues to solve. After a major policy change by the United States following the Gulf conflict, a clear-cut commitment never to use chemical weapons, without any reservation, could be included in the draft Convention. Less than a year ago the States of the international community were faced with a situation in which a serious threat of the use of chemical weapons existed. The experience of the Gulf War has demonstrated once again, however, that there is simply no place any more for such repugnant weapons.

The Twelve note with great satisfaction that the draft treaty now provides for the destruction of all chemical weapons and all chemical-weapons production facilities within 10 years. Agreement has been reached inter alia on the provision of assistance in the event of the use or threat of use of chemical weapons, on the imposition of sanctions in the event of violations of the convention and on economic and technological cooperation. Other articles related to the granting of assistance in case of the use or threat of use of chemical weapons, to sanctions in the case of violation of the convention, to economic and technological cooperation and to some other subjects.

A few major complicated issues remain to be solved. Paramount among them is the question of verification. Substantial discussions on challenge

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

inspections and on the verification of non-production of chemical weapons in the chemical industry have taken place. The Twelve want an effectively verifiable convention and will continue to work in a constructive and positive way to achieve that goal.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

To that end they support an effective system of routine inspections of chemical plants which are capable of producing chemical weapons and their precursors. They also strongly support provisions concerning the right of intrusive challenge inspections as the final deterrent against violations.

Other complex issues that remain to be solved include: how to ensure universality of membership for the future chemical weapons convention, the membership of the executive council of the future organization for the implementation of the chemical weapons convention, and the handling of old and/or abandoned chemical weapons.

Many problems have been solved. A few difficult ones remain. The negotiators in Geneva are totally engaged in an attempt to achieve a final agreement on the convention by 1992.

A vigorous collective effort and the resolute determination of all participants in the negotiations will be required if the deadline of, say, mid-1992 is to be met. It can be done.

Recent events in the Gulf, where there was a serious threat to use chemical weapons, have underscored the vital importance of upholding the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.

The Twelve have reaffirmed repeatedly the validity and importance of the 1925 Geneva Protocol, in particular at the Paris Conference in 1989 and, again, at the Third Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

Convention where they pointed out the close relationship between the Convention and the Protocol.

Universal adherence to both the future chemical weapons convention and to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention will be vital for these treaties to be effective.

The Twelve express the hope that States will make their commitment to the future chemical weapons convention unambiguously clear. It is important that those weapons be banned everywhere and forever. The Twelve have already stated their intention to be among the original signatories to the convention and appeal to all States to ensure its early entry into force.

They also call on all States to declare their intention to become original States parties to the convention so as to assure its early entry into force, its effective implementation and its universal character.

During the recent Third Review Conference of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, the States Parties reaffirmed their conviction that universal adherence would enhance international peace and security.

The Twelve call upon States that have not yet done so to accede to the Convention without delay.

The Conference made further important advances in the fields of confidence-building measures and of verification.

The Twelve believe that the implementation of the new confidence-building measures regime will enhance the effectiveness of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention and call upon all States to provide the information required under the new regime on an annual basis.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

The Twelve further welcome the establishment of an ad hoc Group of Governmental Experts to identify and examine potential verification measures from a scientific and technical standpoint. They express the hope that as a result of that study, implementation of the Convention will become more effective and secure.

Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, since I am speaking in the Committee for the first time and although my colleague in the Committee may already have done so, may I commend you, Sir, for the admirable skill with which you are steering our work and offer you and the officers of the Committee my best wishes for the successful accomplishment of your task.

I have been asked by the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Group to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38 entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace". I deem it an honour to do so since it was Sri Lanka, with Tanzania as a co-sponsor, that introduced the original resolution on this subject, adopted by the General Assembly in 1971.

The preamble of the draft resolution is essentially the same as it was last year. However, it differs in the operative part because this year the ad hoc committee considered that its preparatory work for the holding of a conference in Colombo has been largely completed.

The first and second preambular paragraphs are exactly the same as they were in the draft resolution adopted by the Committee and subsequently adopted by the General Assembly.

The third preambular paragraph is also the same as last year with the addition of the words "held in July 1979" - the date of the Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean.

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

The fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs are unchanged from last year's draft resolution.

In the seventh preambular paragraph, however, there is the addition of one word which endeavours to reflect the reality of today. It refers to "the continued military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean area conceived initially in the context of their confrontation". The slight difference is the addition of the word "initially".

The eighth preambular paragraph is a new paragraph reflecting the recent positive developments in the international political situation. It states:

> "Welcoming the positive developments in international political relations enhancing peace, security and cooperation, and expressing the hope that the new spirit of international cooperation will be reflected in the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean."

We believe that what is happening in the world, particularly in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union and elsewhere should also be reflected in the Indian Ocean region.

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

The ninth preambular paragraph is the same as it was last year.

The tenth preambular paragraph reads:

"Considering that the permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean should work in close cooperation with the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean to ensure the success of the Conference and play their part in the achievement of its objectives".

That also reflects the new realities of the international situation. It is an expression of the conviction that the permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean must also join the littoral and hinterland States in this endeavour.

The eleventh preambular paragraph reads:

"Considering also that the creation of the zone of peace requires cooperation and agreement among the States of the region to ensure conditions of peace and security within the area, as envisaged in the Declaration".

No matter what we may do with regard to Powers outside the region, it is essential that Powers within the region should also get together, cooperate and agree among themselves to ensure conditions of peace and security.

The twelfth preambular paragraph refers to the agenda of the proposed Conference.

As I said, the preamble is largely the same, with the introduction of a few paragraphs to reflect the changed international situation.

Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the operative part are the same as they were in last year's resolution.

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

In paragraph 4 the General Assembly notes with satisfaction the preparatory work done by the Ad Hoc Committee in the implementation of the mandate entrusted to it for the convening of the Conference. As I said before, the Ad Hoc Committee considers its task to be largely completed.

In paragraph 5 the Assembly decides that the Conference should be structured in more than one stage. The reasons for that are explained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

In paragraph 6 the Assembly decides that the first stage of the Conference at Colombo in 1993, or as soon as possible, should be held in accordance with the present draft resolution.

In paragraph 7 the Assembly recommends that participation in the Conference should be at an appropriately high political level.

In paragraph 8 the Assembly calls for the full and active participation in the Conference of the permanent members of the Security Council and the major maritime users of the Indian Ocean.

In paragraph 9 the Assembly requests the Secretary-General to appoint a Secretary-General of the Conference at an appropriate time.

In paragraph 10 the Assembly requests the Secretary-General to invite all States to participate in the Conference.

Paragraph 11 refers to documentation.

In paragraph 12 the Assembly decides that the Ad Hoc Committee will hold a session of five working days in 1992 to perform its preparatory functions for the various stages envisaged for the Conference.

Lastly, in paragraph 13 the Assembly decides to include in the provisional agenda of the forty-seventh session the item entitled

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

"Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", to keep the matter alive until the Conference is held in 1993.

That is the essence of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38; I present that draft resolution on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and commend it to the Committee, and I hope that it will receive unanimous support. Before I close my presentation, I should like to thank all those who assisted in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, of which I was Chairman in 1991, in particular Mr. Kheradi, chief adviser to the Ad Hoc Committee, whose expertise was always available and invaluable, and Mr. Matsouka, the Conference Secretary, who, like me, was new to the Ad Hoc Committee and who did his very best, for which we are thankful. I also thank all my colleagues in the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. BELLINA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): I am pleased to introduce on behalf of the delegation of Peru draft decision A/C.1/46/L.10, entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale".

Peru is deeply committed to regional disarmament efforts and fully convinced of the effectiveness of the regional approach in achieving real, tangible progress in the area of arms control and arms reduction. Major global disarmament efforts will be possible only if their basic components are regional arrangements. There can be no "islands of peace" in a world from which the potential causes of conflict have not completely disappeared, especially in view of the growing interdependence of all countries.

Latin America has amply demonstrated its dedication to peace, from the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the Ayacucho Declaration, the Esquipulas agreements and the Galapagos Declaration to the proposal made by my country's President, Alberto Fujimori, on regional disarmament, not to mention other regional initiatives of great importance and relevance.

(Mr. Bellina, Peru)

As at the last session, the draft decision submitted by Peru is intended to make it possible to retain in the provisional agenda of the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session the item entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale". In the draft decision the General Assembly also welcomes the report of the Secretary-General based on the views conveyed by various Member States on this question and invites States which have not yet done so to convey to the Secretary-General their views on the matter.

My country warmly thanks Member States that have submitted their reports to the Secretary-General. We wish to present a draft resolution on this item once there is sufficient information from Member States, with a view to a balanced and fair consideration of all aspects of the process of conventional disarmament on a regional scale.

The text presented for consideration is procedural in nature, and we therefore hope that the Committee will adopt it without a vote.

(Mr. Bellina, Peru)

I should also like to take this opportunity to introduce draft decision A/C.1/46/L.39, entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee".

As President of the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty, Peru convened a meeting here at Headquarters of the States parties to the Treaty in order to achieve consensus agreement on preparations for the 1995 Conference. That agreement is embodied in the draft decision.

In the draft decision the General Assembly would take note of the intent of the parties to form a preparatory committee in 1993 for the Conference called for in article X, paragraph 2, of the Treaty, and decides to include in the provisional agenda of its forty-seventh session the item entitled "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee".

I should like to add that the States parties also agreed to convene an informal meeting at Headquarters at the end of 1992 to decide on organizational aspects of the Preparatory Committee, which should meet here at Headquarters in the first half of 1993.

Taking into account the process that led to the agreement embodied in the draft decision, and the fact that it was adopted by consensus, my delegation trusts that the draft will be adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Mexico to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): On behalf of the delegations of Bolivia, Indonesia, Nigeria, Peru, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and my own delegation, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

A/C.1/46/L.28, on agenda item 52, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water".

In 1963 the original parties to the partial test-ban Treaty undertook to work for the permanent suspension of all test explosions of nuclear weapons and to continue negotiations to that end. In spite of that commitment and the urgent appeals of the General Assembly for three decades, the international community still does not have a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The subject has been discussed bilaterally and trilaterally and at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Various problems connected with a comprehensive test-ban treaty, particularly the problem of verification of compliance, have been analysed. It may be said that no other disarmament question has been studied and debated more than that of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It is simply a matter of lack of political will.

In order to mobilize world public opinion further, particularly in countries where testing continues, a group of countries proposed a few years ago the convening of an Amendment Conference, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article II of the partial test-ban Treaty, to turn it into a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The Amendment Conference held an organizational meeting from 29 May to 8 June 1990, and began its substantive work at a meeting held from 7 to 18 January this year. The draft resolution would take note of the decision adopted by the Amendment Conference that, since further work was needed on certain aspects of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, particularly with regard to verification of compliance with the treaty and possible sanctions against non-compliance, the President of the Conference should conduct consultations

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

with a view to achieving progress on those issues and resuming the work of the Conference at an appropriate time.

Under paragraph 3 the General Assembly would welcome the ongoing consultations being conducted by the President of the Amendment Conference and the holding in 1992 of more structured open-ended consultations, as well as the establishment of a group of friends of the President in order to examine various aspects of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, with a view to resuming the work of the Conference as soon as possible.*

By the draft resolution the General Assembly would recall its recommendation that arrangements should be made to ensure that intensive efforts continue, under the auspices of the Amendment Conference, until a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is achieved. Therefore, under paragraph 4 the General Assembly would call upon all parties to the Treaty to participate in, and to contribute to the success of, the Amendment Conference for the achievement of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban at an early date, as an indispensable measure towards implementation of their undertakings in the preamble to the Treaty.

Furthermore, after urging all States, especially those nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so, to adhere to the Treaty, the Assembly would reiterate its conviction that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, the nuclear-weapon States should suspend all nuclear-test explosions through an agreed moratorium or unilateral moratoria.

---

* Mr. Alpman (Turkey), Vice-President, took the Chair.

(Mr. Maria Bosch, Mexico)

Under the draft resolution the General Assembly would also recommend that arrangements be made in order to ensure the fullest possible participation of non-governmental organizations in the Amendment Conference. That is an important aspect, because public opinion is fundamental for the success of the Conference.

For years now the General Assembly has been reiterating its conviction that a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is the highest-priority measure for halting the nuclear-arms race and bringing about nuclear disarmament. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28 share that conviction.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Yugoslavia to introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.8 and A/C.1/46/L.37.

Mr. KOTEVSKI (Yugoslavia): I have great pleasure in introducing two draft resolutions on behalf of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. They are draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.8, "Relationship between disarmament and development", and draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37, "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

The draft resolution on the relationship between disarmament and development is mainly of a procedural nature. Its purpose is to welcome the report of the Secretary-General (A/46/527) and actions taken in accordance with the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. The Secretary-General is requested to continue to take action for the implementation of the action programme adopted at the International Conference in 1987. He is also requested to submit a report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

The non-aligned countries attach particular importance to this issue, especially in the current international circumstances, which provide realistic prospects of full implementation of the action programme adopted at the International Conference. It is our belief that the relationship between disarmament and development is gaining new momentum, particularly in preparations for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, to be held next year in Brazil. In that context, I wish only to underline an idea that in our opinion is extremely valuable, one that we heard in the general debate on disarmament in this Committee, when the Ambassador of Brazil said:

"As we turn a new page in history, democracy, development and disarmament should constitute the foundations supporting the new structure of peace." (A/C.1/46/PV.4, p. 73)

This is an issue of exceptional importance, and we earnestly believe that the Committee will adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

The second draft resolution which I have the honour to introduce on behalf of the non-aligned countries is related to bilateral nuclear arms negotiations. The proposed draft particularly highlights the breakthrough in relationship between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States that took place since the last session. The emphasis is plain on signing the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), as well as in the recent proposals of President Bush and President Gorbachev for further reduction of strategic weapons.

In our opinion, that clearly demonstrated the will of the two Governments to continue these negotiations. We welcome these developments as a significant contribution to the process of disarmament.

We also recall the stated intention of the two Governments concerned to pursue further negotiations on nuclear and space arms, following the signature of the treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms, and to give these negotiations the highest priority. At the same time, in the view of the Non-Aligned Movement, it is particularly important and timely that the international community give a new impetus to the ongoing negotiations and to stress the need to promote the negotiations on some issues of special concern, such as the achievement of the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and prevention of the arms race in outer space.

The positive effects of these negotiations for the overall process of disarmament are indisputable. That is precisely why the non-aligned countries wish to emphasize the inseparable link between bilateral and multilateral negotiations that should be complementary and mutually promotional. General and complete disarmament cannot be achieved unless all countries are included in these processes.

(Mr. Kotevski, Yugoslavia)

In that context we call upon the Soviet Union and the United States to keep other Member States of United Nations duly informed of their negotiations.

After many years, we are in a situation where we have only one proposed draft resolution concerning this topic. It is our firm belief that new circumstances in international relations can achieve a breakthrough in bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and create the necessary conditions where the international community would speak with one voice on this topic of extreme significance for the whole of mankind.

The proposed draft, which I have the honour to introduce today, is the result of the earnest efforts of the non-aligned countries to reflect the remarkable positive developments which have taken place in bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations, as well as their wish that it represent the opinion of the General Assembly as a whole. We are aware that this proposal can still be improved and therefore we express our readiness to continue negotiations with all interested countries and groups. There, we particularly have in mind the delegation of the United Kingdom, which in previous years has submitted a draft on behalf of the Western Group, with whose members there continues to exist an extremely good spirit of cooperation.

Bearing that in mind, I would like, in conclusion, once again to emphasize our wish and hope that this year's resolution on bilateral and nuclear-arms negotiations should reflect the unanimity of the whole international community and that it should be adopted without a vote.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): The delegation of Yugoslavia has just introduced draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37 on bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations. As he pointed out, for the first time in some years the United Kingdom has not introduced a rival draft. The delegations of the United

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

Kingdom and Yugoslavia did work hard to try to produce a text before the deadline for submission, which could have commanded consensus among the supporters of both of last year's resolutions. I thank the delegation of Yugoslavia for their efforts during that period.

Sadly, time ran out on us. However, in order to demonstrate the strength of our wish to see a single consensus resolution this year, no alternative text was submitted by my delegation. I have asked to speak, Mr. Chairman, to submit to you, and through you to all delegations, our view that in this of all years it would be very sad if the First Committee were not able to welcome by consensus the momentous bilateral achievements of the last 12 months. The self-same point has just been made by the representative of Yugoslavia.

It is not just a question of welcoming the full implementation of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles Treaty (INF) and the signature of the long awaited Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), significant as they are, but also the recent initiative of Presidents Bush and Gorbachev which have given a dramatic new turn to nuclear-arms control and disarmament, seen by the press indeed as the start of the disarmament race.

The United States and the Soviet Union have told us that they themselves recognize that it is only the beginning of a new phase and we are sure there is no delegation here whose Government would not wish to join with the wider international community in encouraging and supporting the two Governments in their continuing efforts, as indicated in operative paragraph 5 of A/C.1/46/L.37. However, what is the value in adopting a resolution which is not supported by both the Governments concerned. To achieve this we need to avoid including language, like the current operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37, which is not factually correct. That paragraph

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

rewrites the stated intention of the two Governments in terms which other Governments would like them to be but which do not currently reflect the stated policy of the two principals.

These concerns on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, and on prevention of an arms race in outer space, are of course of great concern to the wider membership of the United Nations, but they are already covered by their own resolution.

Do we really need to insist that these concerns be pressed in a resolution whose primary purpose is different?

My delegation intends to continue negotiations in the traditional way with the principal sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.37 in an effort to agree on those modifications to that text which might make consensus possible.

In addition to working in this traditional way with the delegation of Yugoslavia and others, we would be happy to explain to any interested delegation which areas of A/C.1/46/L.37 causes difficulty. We would do so in the spirit of cooperation that the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union have already shown and for which they should be unanimously thanked.

Mr. WALKER (Jamaica): The United Nations mechanisms to control, resolve and prevent conflicts, though developing throughout the past decades, have gained momentum in recent years.

In this connection, attention has been drawn to the examination of the possibility of regulation, limitation and equal reduction of armaments and the armed forces in a coordinated and comprehensive programme. At the same time, there has been extensive consideration of the fundamental role of

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

confidence-building, the promotion of security among States, and mutual cooperation.

The final document adopted in 1978 during the first extraordinary period dedicated to disarmament, provides in its programme of action that agreements and the adoption of other measures aiming to strengthen international peace and security and to promote confidence between States must proceed resolutely on a bilateral, regional and multilateral basis.

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

Similarly, the World Disarmament Campaign launched by the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (1982) established a series of objectives and accomplishments reflected in the Regional Centres for peace and development in Africa, in Asia and the Pacific, and in Latin America and the Caribbean, created during the last decade by the United Nations.

We have to recognize that, on the one hand, the practice of dialogue and understanding has evolved as a means to strengthen international relations. On the other hand, the sources of conflict have expanded to include elements which today have acquired a new importance and require our attention.

The task of the Centres, which would complement the decisions that are adopted in New York and in the regions, is every day more relevant in the light of the elements I have mentioned, particularly with a view to strengthening the possibility of increasing the effectiveness of the Organization's preventive diplomacy and regional efforts in that regard.

My delegation, in its capacity as Chairman of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, is introducing draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14, entitled "Review and implementation of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly: United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean".

Representatives from Africa and Asia will join in supporting the draft resolution.

In its preamble, the draft resolution refers to the resolutions of the General Assembly calling for the establishment of the aforementioned Regional Centres. It also refers to the previous resolutions on regional disarmament.

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

The preamble also refers to the significant contribution of the programmes carried out by the Regional Centres, and to the need to provide stability and financial viability in order to facilitate the effective planning and execution of their activities.

It also reiterates the conviction that the initiatives and activities mutually agreed upon by Member States of the respective regions that are directed to the strengthening of confidence and mutual security, as well as to the implementation and coordination of regional activities under the World Disarmament Campaign, would encourage and facilitate the development of effective measures of confidence-building, arms limitation and disarmament in these regions.

The last preambular paragraphs give full recognition to the Member States, as well as the governmental and non-governmental organizations that have contributed to the trust funds of the three Regional Centres. They also take note, with appreciation, of the Secretary-General's report (A/46/365), and recognize his efforts in providing the necessary administrative measures for the effective functioning of the Centres.

In operative paragraph 1 the General Assembly would encourage the Centres to continue their efforts in accordance with their mandate with a view to facilitating the development of effective measures of confidence-building, arms limitation and disarmament.

In operative paragraph 2, the Assembly would commend the Secretary-General for his efforts in providing assistance to the Regional Centres for the fulfilment of their functions and request the continuation of his support.

(Mr. Walker, Jamaica)

In operative paragraph 3 an appeal is made to Member States, as well as to international and governmental and non-governmental organizations to continue contributing to the trust funds of each Regional Centre in order to strengthen their respective programmes.

Operative paragraph 4 states:

"Decides that, to ensure continued financial viability of the centres, the administrative costs of the centres shall be financed from the regular budget".

I wish here to emphasize that funding from the regular budget of the United Nations will provide stability to the Regional Centres and allow us to assure non-governmental organizations and other potential donors that their contributions will be used exclusively for academic programmes.

In view of the broad consensus on the draft resolution, we trust and very much hope that it will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. NDIAYE (Gabon) (interpretation from French): Since this is the first time I am speaking in the Committee, I should like to congratulate Mr. Mroziewicz on his election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. I should also like to congratulate the other officers on their election.

On behalf of the African Group, of which I am the Chairman for November, I should like to associate myself with previous speakers on item 61 of the agenda.

Indeed, with the support of our Organization, regional centres for peace and disarmament have been established to promote peace and security throughout the world The conferences, workshops and seminars that have been organized

(Mr. Ndiaye, Gabon)

by the Centres have been made possible through donations from Member States. For some time these Centres have been experiencing serious financial difficulties in continuing their activities, particularly in terms of administration. The purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 is to assure the financial viability of the various Regional Centres for peace and disarmament by means of an entry in the regular budget of the Organization.

On behalf of the African Group, I should like to ask the Committee to lend its full support to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 introduced by the representative of Jamaica.

Mr. ACHARYA (Nepal): The representative of Jamaica has just introduced draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14, on the United Nations Regional Centres for peace and disarmament, on behalf of the sponsors from Asia and the Pacific, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

According to their mandate, the Regional Centres should provide, on request, substantive support for the initiatives and other activities mutually agreed upon by Member States of the region concerned for the implementation of measures for peace and disarmament. In other words, establishment of the Regional Centres represents recognition by the General Assembly of the growing emphasis that Member States have been placing on regional approaches to the intricate questions of arms control, disarmament and confidence-building measures. The report of the Secretary-General, document A/46/365, gives an excellent summary of the activities of the Regional Centres over the past years.

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

The Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament for Asia and the Pacific, located in Kathmandu, Nepal, has been active in disseminating information on activities of the United Nations in the areas of arms control and disarmament. The Centre, however, has been engaged in something even more important. Responding to the need felt for confidence-building measures in the Asia-Pacific region, the Centre has organized two major meetings in Kathmandu. Those meetings brought together, in an informal setting, diplomats, experts and academicians - from both within and outside the region - in an effort to identify areas of common approach and elements for possible future agreements.

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

I do not need to reiterate here that confidence-building measures are not and cannot be a substitute for arms-control and disarmament measures. Their value in creating conditions favourable for arms-control agreements has, however, been widely recognized. The success of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe are examples that readily come to mind. Nor do I need to reiterate that each region has its own security conditions and perceptions, and that successful confidence-building measures from one region cannot simply be transplanted to other regions. Nevertheless, the European process provides useful guidelines and examples, among them the incremental nature of the confidence-building measures there. CSCE was developed through patient and protracted negotiations spread over many years. The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe was a direct result of those patient endeavours.

My delegation believes that the potential of the Regional Centres should be viewed against that background. The Regional Centres depend exclusively on voluntary contributions for their substantive activities. The Secretary-General has been providing them with all feasible support. The Department for Disarmament Affairs, under the leadership of its able Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Akashi, deserves our appreciation for the optimal use it has been making of the meagre resources available for the activities of the Centres. The performance and potential of the Centres have recently been attracting growing attention from Governments, foundations and non-governmental organizations. Needless to say, voluntary support is predicated on the maintenance of a minimum of administrative structure.

(Mr. Acharya, Nepal)

It is with those considerations in mind that the sponsors of the draft resolution on Regional Centres have decided to approach the General Assembly for the financing from the regular budget of the administrative costs of the three Centres. Making that decision was not easy for us, aware as we are of the views of some Member States on matters of the budget. However, in the larger interest of the continued viability and effectiveness of the Regional Centres, my delegation trusts that Member States will give overwhelming support to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/46/L.14.

Mr. RASAPUTRAM (Sri Lanka): I am very pleased to speak in support of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14, introduced today by the representative of Jamaica. The Regional Centres for peace and disarmament form a vital link between disarmament efforts and confidence-building in disarmament affairs. Recent events have indicated the urgent need for regional measures to increase the peace and security of the entire world. Regional dialogue and regional dissemination of knowledge would enable us to take steps forward and achieve greater progress in disarmament affairs.

The Regional Centre in Asia has made a lasting impact on Governments and non-governmental organizations. In all matters relating to disarmament, differing perceptions of the security interests of States can obstruct progress towards general and complete disarmament unless we search for means that are specific to regions and subregions, and for means of overcoming the problems that are specific to them. We know that cultural, ethnic, linguistic and economic factors are among the major threats to the peace and security of regions. Regional solutions that can be worked into a global framework must necessarily emerge from well-informed discussions and dialogues within the regions.

(Mr. Rasaputram, Sri Lanka)

In order to move forward towards our objective, it is imperative to broaden and expand the areas of understanding and interaction in seeking to reach agreement on various issues that tend to disturb regional stability. The Asian Centre has conducted a number of very useful seminars and workshops to provide up-to-date information to all interested parties.

We have to strengthen those institutions not only to exchange information but also to build on areas that are within easy reach of agreement and to ensure that confidence-building measures have their expected impact.

The resources required for the expansion of the work of these Regional Centres would be an extremely insignificant portion of military budgets. As the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Akashi, said in this Committee, it is important to train and immerse the younger generations in peace-making and peace-keeping methods for the good of their own future. The Regional Centres are appropriately situated to make the younger generations in the regions understand the problems and to assist Governments to work with speed to arrive at acceptable solutions. Expansion of such work in the Regional Centre in Asia, which has the highest population and a low level of education, would require additional resources. We appeal to all members of the international community to provide continuing and adequate resources to carry out the important work of all the Regional Centres for disarmament, wherever they are located.

In order for the Centres to plan and carry out their programmes of work undisturbed by uncertainties that affect the efficiency of their administrative structure, it is important that the administrative costs of all

(Mr. Rasaputram, Sri Lanka)

the Centres be met by regular budget of the United Nations. That would enable the Centres to have the services of qualified people dedicated to working for the cause of peace.

As mentioned by the representative of Jamaica, we are hopeful that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

Mr. BRECHON (United States of America): The United States has asked to speak this morning to express its views on issues raised in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 regarding a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We believe that elements of that draft resolution perpetuate a number of myths about nuclear testing. We believe those myths are misleading. Let me try to help dispel them as the members of the First Committee consider how they will vote on this draft resolution.

Allow me to mention a few. Myth number one: A comprehensive test-ban treaty would halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The fact, we believe, is that a comprehensive test-ban treaty would not achieve such a goal. For example, few if any would seriously argue that Iraq's secret nuclear-weapons-development programme, carried out in the absence of testing, and similar ongoing efforts elsewhere would have been affected by a test ban.

Myth number two: Preventing qualitative improvements to existing nuclear weapons would enhance stability. The fact, we believe, is that the lack of qualitative improvements would actually promote destabilization. Nuclear weapons have to meet rigorous safety, security and operational standards. A minimum and prudent programme of testing, we believe, is required in order that those standards can be met. Without testing, no one can be sure the weapons are safe and up to standard. The resulting uncertainty could result in miscalculation and thus greater insecurity.

(Mr. Brecken, United States)

Myth number three: Testing cannot be conducted in an environmentally safe way. The fact, we believe, is that there is a large body of unbiased scientific data which attests to the environmental safety of properly conducted underground nuclear tests. Our French colleague alluded to some of these reports in his statement to the Committee on 30 October. The quantity and quality of these and other reports cannot and should not be ignored.

Myth number four: Testing is no longer needed because of improved cooperation between the major nuclear-weapon States and because of the build-down of nuclear-weapons inventories. The fact, we believe, is that improved relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have permitted very substantial reductions in nuclear weapons, both negotiated reductions and unilateral reductions, but for the United States testing is still required for those weapons which remain. Deterrence continues to be the foundation upon which we and our Treaty allies base our collective defence. Nuclear weapons remain an important part of that strategy. Testing is required to maintain the safety, security and reliability of these weapons so long as they exist.

The United States position on a comprehensive test-ban treaty is clear, and has not changed. We see a comprehensive test ban as a long-term objective, and it must be viewed in the context of a time when the United States and its allies no longer need to depend on nuclear deterrence to ensure international security and stability, and when the world has achieved broad, deep and effectively verifiable arms reductions, substantially improved verification capabilities, expanded confidence-building measures and greater balance in conventional forces.

(Mr. Breckon, United States)

The United States believes that the myths which underlie elements of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 on a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be reviewed in the light of the facts as we see them. The myths appeal to our hopes for a just world without the need for arms for deterrence and defence. They have a powerful allure. All of us, however, have a responsibility to look at the world realistically. While we work to ameliorate the underlying political differences which create tension, we must also be careful to consider with prudence those essential precautions that are vital to international stability and to our national security.

As delegations consider their votes on the draft resolution on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, the United States delegation asks that they keep these considerations in mind.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to note that my delegation has just learned with great sorrow of the death of Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal of India. We wish to convey our sincere condolences to the delegation of India upon the death of Ambassador Jaipal. Ambassador Jaipal was Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and a distinguished representative of India at the United Nations and in various countries. He was a good friend of the Argentine Republic, and we felt deep friendship for him. He was without question one of the greatest multilateral diplomats of the last half century. We regret the fact that in the past few weeks the world community has lost two great champions of disarmament: Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico and now Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal of India. With a profound sense of friendship, we express out condolences to both delegations.

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

Before I turn to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36, I should like to express my gratitude and that of my delegation to the delegation of France for the statements it made yesterday concerning the study of the possibility of ratifying Additional Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which my Government regards as a very valuable step. We are also grateful to the sponsors for deciding to withdraw the draft resolution on the issue that was before the Committee. My Government will study very carefully the draft decision which the Ambassador of Mexico will submit to those concerned.

I wish now to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36. The negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the chemical-weapons convention finally seem to have prospects of concluding soon. It is particularly heartening to note the flexible and constructive approach that has enabled a fresh impetus to be given to a negotiating process whose lack of progress was in marked contrast to the positive international environment. We therefore welcome the political will to conclude the convention as soon as possible, so that 1992 may be the year in which the Conference on Disarmament finally presents the Committee with its first multilateral disarmament treaty.

The deadline is tight, but if anything positive can come from the prolongation of negotiations on this matter for more than a decade, it is that all the participants are now well aware of the specific areas in which we should rapidly concentrate our greatest efforts in the coming months, in this last stage, in order to establish a balanced and effective text. There is no justification for delay.

We are convinced that all countries that are members of the Conference on Disarmament, even those needing more time for reflection, will help to ensure

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

that the First Committee begins its consideration of the convention at the next session of the General Assembly. The draft resolution (A/C.1/46/L.36), introduced by the Ambassador of Canada, will in our view give the matter the proper impetus, and we therefore fully support it.

The CHAIRMAN: I share the feelings expressed by the representative of Argentina concerning the untimely loss of Ambassador Jaipal of India.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.